

**REMARKS**

The final Office Action dated January 9, 2006, indicates that claims 19 through 27 are pending. A Notice of Appeal is being filed concurrently herewith. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102**

The Office Action maintains the rejection of claims 19 through 27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,035,304 (“Machida”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, and asserts that the pending claims are patentable over Machida for at least the reasons presented below.

Machida discusses systems and methods for storing and playing a multimedia application with a variety of services added to the main application. Col. 1, lines 43-48. According to Machida, an application comprises a main service and additional services. Col. 5, lines 25-32. An example of a main service is a channel of a TV broadcast, while an additional service may be pictures, text, etc. Col. 5, lines 25-32. Service adding information (“SAI”) is included with an application to provide the necessary information and methods to display additional services. Col. 5, lines 40-49. SAIs are broadcast and stored prior to the broadcast of applications and have associated IDs which correspond to the respective application. Col. 6, lines 20-23. Included with the broadcast of application data are trigger codes. Col. 22, lines 19-22. When the system receives a trigger, the SAI is used to process and insert the desired additional service. Col. 17, lines 6-14.

In contrast to Machida, independent claim 19 is directed to a method for synchronizing and propagating changes to an event. Events are registered in a first table, with each event assigned an event identifier. Additionally, event triggers corresponding to the registered events are stored in said first table. Interests are registered in a second table

that stores procedures to execute for a given trigger. Upon a change in an event, an event trigger is generated. When a trigger is generated, the first table is inspected for the event trigger. Upon finding the trigger, the second table is inspected for the procedure(s) to execute for the event trigger for the event identifier. The procedure(s) found are then executed. Independent claims 23 and 27 comprise substantially similar elements, cast as a system and computer readable media, respectively, for executing the method of independent claim 19.

More particularly, for example, Machida, considered alone or in combination with the prior art of record, neither teaches nor suggests, *inter alia*, “changing said event wherein said change generates an event trigger,” as specified in claim 19. The Examiner asserts that the main service, main application, or commercial in Machida corresponds to the “event” limitation recited in Applicant’s claimed invention (e.g., claim 19). Final Office Action, 1/9/2006, p. 7. The Examiner further asserts that receiving user input during execution of an event in Machida corresponds to changing an event, and more specifically, that user input is a change to an event. Final Office Action, 1/9/2006, pp. 4, 7.

Applicant respectfully submits, however, that upon further review of the corresponding sections of Machida, the main service or application is not changed to generate an event trigger. Said differently, the alleged “event trigger” in Machida is not generated based on an event change. More specifically, in Machida, receiving user input (e.g., for interaction with an interactive commercial) invokes or initiates an action to be taken with respect to the main service or main application. That is, receiving user input in Machida is an indication that an action is to be taken with respect to the event—it is not itself a change or a modification of the event, nor therefore a “change [of the event that] generates an event trigger,” as claimed by Applicant.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the asserted rejection appears to improperly rely on different events within Machida to allegedly satisfy common claim

limitations recited throughout the claim. For instance, claim 19 recites assigning an event an event identifier, registering an event, and changing the event; however, the Office Action appears to inconsistently rely on various distinct events in Machida (e.g., create table event, DisplayInfoMark event, Display message event, and a Display event for user GUI display; see Machida at Col. 22, lines 29 through 67) to allegedly read the claim language on Machida. Applicant respectfully submits that such events in Machida simply do not satisfy the combination of limitations as required by Applicant's claimed invention (e.g., claim 19).

The dependent claims of the present application contain additional features that further substantially distinguish the invention of the present application over the prior art of record. Given the applicants' position on the patentability of the independent claims, however, it is not deemed necessary at this point to delineate such distinctions.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of all rejections and objections, and submits that the application is in condition allowance for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited. To expedite prosecution of this application to allowance, the examiner is invited to call Applicant's undersigned representative to discuss any issues relating to this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: June 9, 2006

David V. Rossi  
Reg. No. 36,659  
BROWN RAYSMAN MILLSTEIN  
FELDER & STEINER LLP  
900 Third Avenue  
New York, New York 10022  
Tel : (212) 895-2000  
Fax: (212) 895-2900